

Appl. No. 10/678,985
Amdt. Dated Sep.22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jul. 20, 2004

REMARKS

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozel et al. 5938456 in view of Peterson 5342221.

Applicant respectfully traverses this obviousness rejection. As stated by the Examiner, Peterson discloses an electrical connector 16 having passageways 62-76 of varying geometries to prevent mating with an incorrect connector. Further, receptacles 62 of Peterson are configured to match the configuration of silos 42 while the socket terminals 112 are configured in the same configuration. However, **one object of Kozel et al. is to provide a connector which accepts a conductive pin from either the top or bottom of the connector**, regarding column 1, lines 42-44 of Kozel et al. Referring to FIGS. 10 and 11, it is clearly shown that the pin 84 disposed in a header or a printed circuit board could extend through access hole 70 defined in the contact 14 from two opposite orientations and **press against the arms 68** of the stirrup 64 so as to achieve the above object. In this view, as the pins 84 are of the same geometry, if the openings 26 of Kozel et al. are pressed with varying geometries, the pins 84 could NOT be successfully inserted into all of the passages 24 to electrically connect with the contacts 14. Therefore, simply applying the passageways of Peterson to Kozel et al., the invention of Kozel et al. is infeasible.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Kozel et al. 5938456 in view of Peterson 5342221. Dependent claim 2 and claim 3 are also believed to be patentable since

Appl. No. 10/678,985
Amdt. Dated Sep.22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jul. 20, 2004

they depend from claim 1.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kozel et al. and Kaufman et al.

Based upon applicant's arguments filed on June 30, 2004, the Examiner states that Figure 2 of Peterson does disclose a board mounted connector 16, and Figures 4-8 of Peterson are not being considered. Applicant does not agree with this point. Referring BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS of Peterson, applicant notes that FIG. 4 is a perspective view of a socket-type terminal mountable with either of the male connectors shown in FIGS. 1 and 2. Similarly, FIGS. 5-8 also relates to FIGS. 1 and 2. So it is unreasonable to interpret the invention of Peterson without consideration of Figures 4-8. Further, Peterson neither teach nor indicate the electrical connector 16 disclosed therein could be replaced by an electrical connector adapted to be mounted onto a printed circuit board. Since **both of the first contacts 112 and the second contacts 114 of Peterson are terminated with the wires of cable**, simply providing surface mounting tails of Kozel et al. and mounting pads of Kaufman et al. to the first housing 20 disclosed in Peterson is infeasible and is far away from the application of the invention recited in Peterson.

Therefore, claim 9 is believed to be patentable over Peterson in view of Kozel et al. and Kaufman et al. Claims 10-11 are also believed to be patentable since they directly depend from claim 9.

Claim 12 is canceled without prejudice, since subject matters defined therein have been limited in original claim 9.

Appl. No. 10/678,985
Amdt. Dated Sep.22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jul. 20, 2004

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
William E. Spink, JR

By 
Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137